DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 721 CS 503 094

AUTHOR Book, Cassandra L.; Pappas, Edward J.
TITLE The Status of Speech Communication in Secondary Schools in the United States: An Update.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (70th, New York, NY, November 13-16, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Design; *Educational Research; School Surveys; Secondary Education; *Speech Communication; *Speech Curriculum; *Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted of schools in 15 states to provide a comprehensive view of the status of speech communication in secondary schools and to compare the current status to that found in earlier surveys. Of the 4,341 schools responding to the survey, 76% indicated that they offered a speech course and of these, 32% indicated that they required the course. Overall, the findings showed that the offerings of speech communication curricula have not changed in the past 15 years. The basic course was a semester long and was offered only once a year to a combination of ninth or tenth through twelfth grade students. The average section had 20 students and was generally 55 minutes long. Although a combination of topics (including oral interpretation, debate, mass media, and drama) were usually taught in the basic course, public speaking dominated the course. The most frequently cited textbook was "The Art of Speaking," by Elson and Peck. Drama was the most frequently offered advanced and extracurricular course. The majority of teachers of speech courses had five or fewer years of experience and 70% of all speech teachers had English as their teaching assignment. Forty-four percent of the teachers indicated graduate work in progress, with 33% having their master's degrees. The teachers did not report strong affiliations with professional associations. (FL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED193721

# The Status of Speech Communication in Secondary Schools in the United States: An Update

Cassandra L. Book
Associate Professor
Department of Communication
Michigan State University

Edward J. Pappas
Professor and Chairman
Department of Speech Communication,
Theatre, and Journalism
Wayne State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Cassandra L. Book
Edward J. Pappas
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503094

Results of surveys of secondary school speech curricula and teacher preparation and experience in fifteen states are described and compared with similar data from previous studies. Reasons why curricular and extra-curricular speech offerings have remained relatively unaltered for the past fifteen years are speculated.

Many studies, both published and unpublished, have sought to assess the status of speech communication in secondary schools. Although the studies posed a variety of questions, the basic thrust of these investigations concerned the nature of the basic course, advanced and extra-curricular offerings, and the training of the speech teachers. Studies conducted since 1965[1] are difficult to compare because each study raised different questions and sampled dissimilar populations (i.e., some sampled only secondary whereas others sampled elementary, junior high and high school programs).

The studies conducted between 1965 and 1973[2] indicated a seemingly large percent of schools offered at least a basic speech course (Ohio, 63 percent; Washington, 87 percent; Massachusetts, 64 percent; Indiana, 99 percent; Michigan 96 percent; Kansas, 90.5 percent; New York, 86 percent), but few required speech for graduation (Ohio, 11 percent; New York (1974), 27 percent; Michigan, 24 percent; Indiana, 6.5 percent). Estimates of the number of students who were actually exposed to speech cources before they graduated were low (Missouri, 33 percent; Ohio, 20 percent; New York, less than 50 percent).

Speech courses varied in duration from one year to units of less than one week (Pennsylvania frequently offered specialized speech units of less than a week and in New York, 25 percent of schools reported that mini-courses in speech were offered within the English curriculum). Indeed, speech was often offered as an English course (in California, 11.6 percent of speech courses were integrated into English courses and 74.4 percent were separate courses within the English Department; in Pennsylvania, 16 percent of schools taught

speech as a separate course in English and 20 percent integrated speech into an English course). Generally, the speech courses emphasized public performance with speeches being the most favored activity followed by dramatics, oral interpretation, group discussion, and debate. These topics usually comprised the basic course and were offered as advanced courses in some instances.

In terms of textbooks used, The New American Speech by Hedde and Brigance was most popular (Ohio, 18.2 percent; Michigan 27.38 percent; New York, 7.4 percent). Other frequently mentioned texts repeatedly included: The Art of Speaking by Elson and Peck - 16.4 percent in Ohio, 8 percent in Michigan, 7.8 percent in New York; Modern Speech by Irwin and Rosenberger - 8.5 percent in Ohio; 21.23 percent in Michigan; Your Speech by Griffith, Nelson and Stasheff - 6.7 percent in Ohio, 9.85 percent in Michigan, 18.9 percent in New York. Many other textbooks were used but not in significant number.

Dramatics was generally the most frequent extra- or co-curricular activity (Pennsylvania, 80 percent; Michigan, 74.4 percent; Washington, 31 percent co-curricular and 58 percent extra-curricular; Massachusetts, 74.4 percent). Individual events or co-curricular speech activities were also frequently offered (Pennsylvania, 94 percent; Michigan, 61.11 percent; Washington, 42 percent co-curricular and 39 percent extra-curricular). Participation in debate tournaments was evident too (Michigan, 49.48 percent; Washington, 44 percent; Massachusetts, 57.7 percent). Other extra-curricular activities such as radio-TV and speakers bureaus were offered in various states including Michigan, California, and New York, but not to the same extent as the more popular activities cited above.

The academic preparation of teachers teaching speech was primarily in English with relatively few teachers having undergraduate majors or minors in speech. In Pennsylvania, 94 percent of teachers teaching speech were certificated in English, 58 percent in social studies, 34 percent in speech and 18 percent in other areas. In Ohio, 63 percent of the speech teachers had taken 18 semester hour in speech while only 18 percent had the 40 semester hours needed for a special certificate in speech. In Michigan 75 percent of the speech teachers had either a major or minor in speech, and 80 percent of the speech teachers in Washington had speech training while 61.5 percent were trained in drama. Less than 17 percent of the speech teachers in Massachusetts had majors in speech or drama and 33 percent had a major or minor in speech or drama. In California, 49.3 percent of the teachers of speech had a major in speech, 21.8 percent had a major or minor in speech. The 1974 New York study reported 64 percent of the speech teachers having a major or minor in speech at either the undergraduate or graduate level. Generally, the studies indicated that few of the teachers of speech returned for graduate work in speech, but rather received graduate degrees in education or English. Kansas and New York studies reported that teachers in larger schools had better credentials in terms of academic preparation in speech.

In terms of years of the service, the speech teacher had not been teaching very long. Of speech teachers in Ohio, 51.3 percent had taught fewer than five years. In Washington, 85 percent had taught 15 years or less. The 1974 New York study reported that the majority of teachers had been teaching less than ten years. Over half of the speech teachers in Kansas were in their first or second year of teaching.

In terms of teaching assignments, teachers of speech rarely taught only speech (in both Ohio and Pennsylvania only 11 percent of the teachers taught only speech; in Washington 6 percent taught only speech and in New York 8 percent taught only speech). Generally, the speech teacher also taught English (in Pennsylvania 75 percent also taught English, 73 percent in Ohio).

Teachers of speech generally were not members of speech associations on state, regional or national levels. In Pennsylvania, 73 percent did not belong to any professional speech association, 6 percent belonged to the Speech Association of America (SAA), 3 percent belonged to Eastern States Speech Association, and 12 percent belonged to the Pennsylvania Speech Association. Of Ohio speech teachers, 12 percent reported belonging to SAA, 4 percent to Central States Speech Association, 13 percent to Ohio Speech Association. Michigan teachers indicated 11 percent belonged to SAA, 4 percent to Central States Speech Association, and 53 percent to Michigan Speech Association. In California, 22.8 percent reported membership in SAA, 14.4 percent in Western Speech Association, and 27.6 percent in California Speech Association.

Current Status of Speech Communication Education

In an effort to gain a more comprehensive and comparable view of the status of speech communication in secondary schools from 1977-1979, sixteen states which are representative of geographical diversity were selected for sampling. Maryland, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts were selected from the Eastern Speech Association Region; Kentucky, Georgia and Texas from the Southern Speech Association region; Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and North Dakota from Central States Speech Association

region; and Washington and California from the Western Speech Association region. This list was not intended to be exhaustive, but rather representative of the concentration of speech programs in states of various sizes across the country.

Since the Michigan study had been completed in 1977, it became the prototype for the other studies (with the exception of Ohio and Wisconsin which had been completed before other state studies were commissioned). During the fall of 1978, researchers[3] were identified from each of the target states and were given a sample questionnaire, codebook for coding responses, sample initial and follow-up letters, and format for reporting data. The intent was to collect parallel data from each state during 1978-1979 to make possible comparisons.

Since the goal was to survey only secondary level schools (grades 9-12 or 10-12), researchers were asked to obtain a complete listing of all public high schools and to send letters to principals of all public secondary schools. Some researchers surveyed both junior and senior high schools (grades 7-12). A follow-up letter was to be sent out within a month of the first mailing to those who did not respond. Principals of schools with no speech program were asked to return the letter in the stamped addressed envelope so that the researcher knew if any program existed or not. Principals were encouraged to give the questionnaire to the speech teacher to complete.

Researchers were asked to do frequency counts on all questions and cross tabulations where indicated.

The data were received by the summer of 1979 from all states except California. Data from an additional survey conducted in Wisconsin is reported when appropriate information was available.

The response rate to questionnaires varied considerably. Some states included both junior and senior high schools in the survey. Of the 8362 schools contacted in fifteen states, 4341 or approximately 52 percent responded. Seventy-six percent or 3297 of the respondents indicated they offered a speech course or program and approximately 24 percent indicated no speech program was offered. Although no definite conclusion can be reached regarding the status of speech communication in the 48 percent of the schools that did not respond at all, it is more likely that those schools do not offer speech courses since schools with no program would be less likely to return the cover letter as requested. They may have assumed that they did not need to respond if they had no program. Thus the 76 percent response is probably an over-estimation of the percent of schools overall offering speech. On the other hand, 39.4 percent is probably a low estimate (number of schools offering programs divided by total number of schools contacted) of speech programs.

A comparison with the previously reported state studies indicates that three states decreased their speech offerings by ten percent or more, (Massachusetts, 64 percent to 53.5 percent; Michigan, 96 percent to 86.6 percent; and Indiana, 99 percent to 83.6 percent), while two states slightly increased their speech offerings (Ohio, 63 percent to 68.3 percent, and Washington, 87 percent to 89.4 percent). Brooks reported that the "1967, 1968 and 1969 surveys indicated that 80 percent to 90 percent of American high schools offered speech for credit."[4]

Of the 76 percent of the schools offering a basic speech course, of those responding to the question, only 32 percent required the course. Thus at a maximum, only 25 percent of the students were required to take a speech

course. Required courses ranged from 2.2 percent to 58.9 percent in different states, with only Minnesota, Wisconsin, (study number 2) and Nebraska requiring it in more than half of the schools. This is comparable to the 0 to 60 percent range of required courses reported by Brooks in 1969, thus indicating "the area in which considerable growth should be expected"[5] did not materialize in the 1970's.

The basic course most frequently was a semester long. On the average, 49.5 percent of the courses were a semester long, 26.4 percent a year long, and 20.8 percent a quarter long. The category "other" served as a catch-all (13.6 percent) and may include quarter long courses as well as tri-mesters and mini-courses.

On the average, the basic course was offered once each year in 50.9 percent of the schools, each semester in 32.2 percent of the schools, and each quarter in 12 percent of the schools. It is important to note that the basic speech course may only be offered one semester or quarter each year, thus enlarging the percent of offerings each year. For example, while 73 percent of the basic speech courses taught in Oklahoma were a year long, 82 percent of the schools indicated the basic course was offered each year and only 14 percent said it was offered each semester. Some of the semester long courses, thus, may only be offered once a year.

The basic course was most frequently offered to a combination of students in grades nine through twelve or ten through twelve. A range of two to fifty students per section of the basic course was reported with twenty students per section as a mode and mean for the states overall. The means ranged from 15.7 students per section in Nebraska and North Dakota to 23 in Maryland, Kentucky, Georgia, Minnesota and Michigan.

The number of sections offered at any one time varied from one to twenty-one in Indiana, but one to nine was commonly reported. However, fifty percent of the schools indicated offering only one section per term.

The length of the basic speech courses was most commonly reported as fifty-five minutes in seven states, fifty minutes in four states and fourty-five minutes in two states. No "creative" time frames, such as extended periods, were identified.

The description of the basic course is identified in Table 1. While the vast majority reported their courses as a combination of topics, then was a strong emphasis on public speaking in many of the schools. Minnesota and Wisconsin seemed to offer more interpersonal communication in their basic courses, but the percentages reported must reflect overlap in the descriptions. More information regarding the nature of the basic course is desirable but was not available from the questionnaire.

INSERT TABLE 1.

Of the 1423 responses to the question "what textbook is used in the basic speech course," the first three most commonly used books were published before 1969 and two of the three were among the books most commonly identified in the previous studies. The most popular text was The Art of Speaking by Elson and Peck, 20.2 percent, followed by Basic Speech Experiences by Carlisle, 15.7 percent, and The New American Speech by Hedde and Brigance, 11.5 percent. Close behind the Heide and Brigance book, was the new Speaking of Communication by Wilkinson, 11.2 percent, Person to Person by Galvin and Book, 10.8 percent, and Patterns in Communication by Hedde, Brigance and Powell, 10 percent.

These last three books were published in the mid 1970's, thus indicating some updating of material and topic covered (i.e. communication). Nonetheless, it is still clear that the textbook selection reflects the predominant public speaking nature of the basic course since the first three choices focus almost exclusively on public speaking. This focus on public speaking was consistent with the emphasis of speech courses for the past several decades.

The low response rate (less than one-third of the respondents) to the question regarding textbooks, coupled with the information regarding the frequency of textbook use, suggested that a large number of teachers were not using speech books to teach the course. Many reported the use of handouts or lecture notes as supplements or replacements for textbooks. Roughly 20 percent of the teachers did not use textbooks at all and another 41 percent used books infrequently. Whether this reflects the oral tradition of teaching speech, a belief that textbooks do not enhance students' learning in this area, lack of funds to purchase books which may be appropriate, or dissatisfaction with available textbooks is unknown.

When asked to identify the means by which students were evaluated in the course, the overwhelming response was by assessment of both written and oral work (76.2 percent). Approximately 19 percent of the respondents indicated evaluations were totally on oral presentations, while less than 1 percent indicated evaluations were totally on written work. Of the seven states indicating an emphasis on public speaking, only three (Penn, Mn, ND) indicated substantial evaluation of oral presentations. Thus it appears even those courses emphasizing public speaking have evaluation of written as well as oral work.

Of those responding to the question "Is speech combined with other courses?" almost 82 percent responded "no". However, of the 17 percent indicating "yes", the most frequent combination was speech with English, which is consistent with previous speech-English combinations.

In summary, speech communication courses and/or programs were identified in 76 percent of the schools. The basic speech communication course of the 1970's was listed as elective in two-thirds of the schools and required in only one-third of the schools. The basic course was described as a semester long, offered only once each year to a combination of ninth or tenth through twelfth graders. The average section had twenty students and was generally fifty-five minutes in length. Although a combination of topics, including interpersonal communication, discussion, oral interpretation, debate, and drama, were usually taught in the basic course, public speaking dominated the course. The most frequently cited textbooks were The Art of Speaking by Elson and Peck (1966), Basic Speech Experiences by Carlisle (1969), The New American Speech by Hedde, Brigance, and Powell (1968), Speaking of Communication by Wilkinson (1975), Person to Person by Galvin and Book (1974), and Patterns in Communication by Hedde, Brigance, and Powell (1975). Evaluation of a combination of both oral and written work was most common. Finally, 82 percent of the responding schools reported that speech was not combined with another course, but when combined, it was most frequently taught with English.

Advanced Speech Courses

In each state drama was the number one most frequently offered "other courses." The range was 35.8 percent to 87.1 percent of schools offering drama.

with the mean at 59.5 percent of all schools offering it. The popularity of drama as an advanced course was also reflected in the previous studies.

The rank order of advanced courses overall and their mean percentages of schools offering them are as follows: (1) drama, 59.5 percent; (2) advanced speech, 30.3 percent; (3) debate, 26.5 percent; (4) radio/television/mass media, 18.5 percent; (5) oral interpretation, 14.9 percent; (6) film, 11.2 percent; (7) discussion, 7.6 percent; and (8) interpersonal communication, 7.0 percent. In comparing this list of advanced courses with those reported in earlier studies, it appears that debate has retained a high position, but oral interpretation has been surpassed by radio-television-mass media. Group discussion seems to have fallen off in frequency of offering.

The frequency of advanced course offering in each of the states is displayed in Table 2.

INSERT TABLE 2.

Extra-Curricular Offerings

In regard to extra curricular offerings, theatre or drama was most frequently offered (78.2 percent) comparable to the frequency of its offering reported in previous studies. The range was 66.8 percent to 92.3 percent of schools per state offering theatre. The second most frequently offered activity was forensics or individual events (53.5 percent), again comparable to the percent of schools offering it in years past. The range was 16.4 percent to 96.6 percent of schools per state offering forensics. Debate was the third most frequently offered activity, with a mean of 39.4 percent of the schools in individual states offering debate was 13.8 percent to 62

percent. Discussion and/or student congress was the least frequently offered extra-curricular speech activity with a mean of 17.5 percent of the schools offering it and a range of 7.9 percent to 23.3 percent of schools in individual states offering the activity. Washington schools do not offer discussion and student congress as an extra-curricular activity at all. Table 3 displays data related to this question.

INSERT TABLE 3.

Teacher Characteristics

Regarding the distribution of the years teachers, who are teaching the basic course, received their bachelors degrees, the majority (46 percent) received their degree between 1970 and 1978 and another one-third received their degree between 1960 and 1969. There was little variation in the pattern across states. It appears a large number of teachers return to school for advanced work. Forty-four percent of those responding to the question indicated graduate work in progress, with thirty-three percent having completed their master's degree and twenty percent doing work beyond their masters degree. It is notable that over 60 percent of the speech teachers in Maryland, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Indiana, had completed their masters degree.

Teachers who were teaching speech courses reported first and second majors earned at the undergraduate level. In two states those with majors in speech were equal to those with English majors. In four states those with English degrees outnumbered those with majors in speech, and in eight states teachers with speech degrees outnumbered those with English majors. Since it is difficult to determine how many teachers held majors in both speech and

English, the interpretation of the data is somewhat ambiguous. Nonetheless four states reported less than thirty percent of the teachers who were teaching speech courses have B.A. majors in speech, communication or theatre and twelve reported less than 60 percent with speech majo . On the graduate level, the majority of teachers in most states were working on or had received graduate majors in English or education rather than in speech, communication or theatre.

Respondents were asked to indicate their years of teaching and coaching speech related areas. The pattern of response was similar for both teaching and coaching, with fifty-two percent indicating they had been teaching five years or less and forty-nine percent indicating they had been coaching for that length of time. Twenty-eight percent more had taught and coached six to ten years and eleven percent had done so for eleven to fifteen years. Approximately six percent had taught and coached sixteen to twenty years with only four percent doing so more than twenty years.

On the average, 70 percent of all speech teachers have English as their teaching assignment in addition to speech. Another twenty percent teach theatre in addition to speech, and other related courses such as mass media, radio and television, journalism and communication are assigned. History or social studies seems to be the other more frequently mentioned course, although math, physical education, foreign languages, and reading were among the other subjects taught by speech teachers.

Secondary levels teachers did not report strong professional affiliations. State speech association memberships averaged twenty-five percent, although the range for individual state memberships varied from ten percent to sixty-two percent. Membership in the regional speech associations averaged three

percent, with little variation among regions. The Speech Communication Association, a national association, claimed membership of approximately eight percent of the teachers, with a range of 2.3 percent to 12.8 percent in individual states.

Respondents were given the opportunity to indicate other professional memberships they held. Included among those were the state theatre association, state forensic association, State and National Councils of Teachers of English. It is not unusual for membership in the State and National Councils of Teachers of English to have been frequently indicated by these speech-English teachers, but it is apparent that professional involvement in speech associations is not a priority overall for these teachers. Indeed, this lack of involvement in professional associations was evident in the previously conducted studies.

Conclusions

The offerings of speech communication curricula in high schools across the United States basically have not changed in the past fifteen years. The same number of courses were being offered, of which fewer in the 1970's, rather than more, were required. The major focus of speech programs continued to be on public speaking and theatre. The only content change seemed to be a slight integration of such new topics as mass media and interpersonal communication into the curricula or basic courses, but no major shift from the more traditional topics occured in spite of changes in college and university speech communication curricula toward such topics.

In response to the question "why have the speech curricula not changed in frequency of offering nor content?" at least three proposals can be

advanced. First, it is easier to maintain the status quo. Young teachers may be finding it easier to teach what previous secondary level speech teachers have taught. New teachers may be inheriting old curriculum guides, lesson plans, or course descriptions from their predecessors and may follow them either out of ease or pressure to conform to past practices. Principals, curriculum committees, school boards, or chairpersons of English or language arts departments (in which the speech courses are usually found), may mandate that public speaking and theatre be taught, since such people may have no knowledge of new advances in communication, much less reason to advocate such changes in the secondary level curricula. In addition, the surveys show that speech teachers are not using current textbooks which include such topics as intrapersonal, interpersonal, and mass communication. Whether teachers are not aware of new texts, choose not to use texts, or are not given the budget to purchase them, is not known. However, teachers are not using this avenue for influencing the speech curricula. Thus, in spite of the training universities and colleges are giving their prospective or in-service secondary level teachers in the advances in the speech communication discipline, their influence is not having an impact on the high school curricula. The status quo of fifteen years ago is being maintained.

A second reason why the high school speech curriculum has not changed may be found in the lack of professional involvement most secondary level speech teachers have in the profession. Usually there is only one speech teacher in a school, thus not permitting daily interaction among colleagues trained in the discipline. Not only do speech teachers not have others with whom to interact in their buildings, but most do not belong to State, regional or

national speech communication associations. By this lack of professional membership, speech teachers are precluded from interaction with other professionals at conferences and from learning about new issues or teaching techniques through participation in workshops or reading the journals. The problem of lack of professional commitment is further exacerbated by the fact that few teachers, many of whom do not have bachelor degrees in speech communication, are returning to graduate school to do advanced work in communication. Perhaps this lack of professional involvement is extended beyond lack of commitment to the discipline, for the majority of teachers seem to have short careers (less than five years) as either speech teachers and/or coaches. Perhaps new teachers are choosing not to alter curricula when they anticipate that they will not be teaching long enough to merit the energy required to bring about change.

Finally, budget cuts may be reducing speech communication curricula and extra-curricular offerings. Traditionally money has been allocated to reading and writing programs first, and when it runs out, speech is considered a "frill" which does not merit funding. Speaking and listening have not been considered "basics" enough to garner a larger share of the purse, although the Title II basic skills grant of the 1978 Elementary and Secondary Education Act may eventually bring funding for speaking and listening programs in line with that for reading and writing.

In essence, speech communication educators of all levels and secondary school administrators have a long way to go to bring secondary level speech communication curricula up to the "Standards for Effective Oral Communication Programs"[6] endorsed by the Speech Communication Association and the American

Speech Language-Hearing Association. Selecting from the enumerated guidelines, the survey data provides evidence of a number of shortcomings of secondary curricula. The lack of updating of curricula offerings and topics covered violates guideline number one:

> *"The oral communication program is based on current theory and research in speech and language development, psycholinguistics, rhetorical and communication theory, communication disorders, speech science, and related fields of study."*

The combination of speech with English or other subjects, albeit a small percentage, violates guideline number two:

> *"Oral communication instruction is a clearly identifiable part of the curriculum."*

While students may be able to use academic, personal and social experiences as data for their public speeches, curricula which include interpersonal and group communication may be able to better fulfill guideline number four:

> *"The relevant academic, personal and social experiences of students provide core subject matter for the oral communication program."*

Finally, a broader based curricula than one emphasizing public speaking must be provided to meet guideline number five:

> *"Oral communication instruction provides a wide range of speaking and listening experiences, in order to develop effective communication skills appropriate to:*
> *a. a range of situations; e.g., informal to formal, interpersonal to mass communication.*
> *b. a range of purposes; e.g., informing, learning, persuading, evaluating messages, facilitating social interaction, sharing feelings, imaginative and creative expression.*
> *c. a range of audiences; e.g., classmates, teachers, peers, employers, family, community.*
> *d. a range of communication forms; e.g., conversation, group discussion, interview, drama, debate, public speaking, oral interpretation.*
> *e. a range of speaking styles; impromptu, extemporaneous, and reading from manuscript."*

Among the standards for the support of effective communication programs, at least three are violated as evidenced from the survey data:

1. *"Oral communication instruction is provided by individuals adequately trained in oral communication and/or communication disorders, as evidenced by appropriate certification.*
2. *Individuals responsible for oral communication instruction receive continuing education on theories, research and instruction relevant to communication.*
3. *Individuals responsible for oral communication instruction participate actively in conventions, meetings, publications, and other activities of communication professionals."*

Thus, much needs to be changed to bring the secondary schools' speech curricula and teaching staff up to the standards for effective oral communication programs. We have a long way to go to improve the quality of secondary level speech communication programs and to ensure that all students have the opportunity to receive systematic instruction in speech communication. The changes in curricula have been minor since the status of speech in secondary schools was reported in 1969, but with the standards for effective secondary level programs and teacher training programs[7] now in place, perhaps the updating of curricula and professional involvement of teachers can be more strongly encouraged and more systematically assessed.

## Footnotes

[1]Brooks, W. D. "The Status of Speech in Secondary Schools: A Summary of State Studies," The Speech Teacher, 18, (Nov., 1969), 276-281. (Studies conducted prior to 1965 are summarized by Brooks.)

[2]Applbaum, R. L. and Hays, E. R. "Speech Education in California Public High Schools: Implications for Teacher Preparation and Curricular Trends," Western Speech Association Journal, 35, (Winter, 1971), 56-62; Carrel, S. D. and Petrie, C. F. "The Status of Speech Education in New York Public Senior High Schools, 1972-73," Today's Speech, 22, 2, (Spring, 1974), 39-50; Dunham, R. E. "Speech Education in Pennsylvania High Schools," Today's Speech, 17, 2, (May, 1969), 38-49; Fausti, R. P. and Vogelsang, R. W. "The Status: In high Schools of the State of Washington," The Speech Teacher, 18, (Jan., 1969), 50-53; Hanley, C. "How Now Speech Program," School and Community, 50, (Oct., 1968), 42-44; Ogilvie, M. "The Status of Speech in Secondary Schools: A Symposium," The Speech Teacher, 18, (Jan., 1969), 39-44; Patton, B. R. and Cropp, D. "A Survey of Speech Activities in Secondary Schools in Kansas, 1969-70," Central States Speech Journal, 71, (Fall, 1970), 191-195; Petrie, C. R., Jr. and McManus, T. R. "Status of Speech in Ohio Secondary Schools," The Speech Teacher, 17, (Jan., 1968), 19-26; Prosser, M. H. "The Status of Speech in New York," Today's Speech, 17, 2, (May, 1969), 66-78; Ratliffe, S. A. and Herman, D. M. "The Status: In High Schools of Michigan," The Speech Teacher, 18, (Jan., 1969), 45-49; Sinzinger, R. A. "Speech Programs in Massachusetts High Schools," The Speech Teacher, 18, (Sept., 1969), 213-216.

[3]Appreciation for conducting state surveys is given to the following: Joseph L. McCaleb, and Linda Hamer, Maryland; Carolyn Del Polito, Pennsylvania; Kenneth Brown, with Rosemary Deusser and

Scott Elliott, Massachusetts: Jerry Mayes and James Booth, Kentucky; Don Rubin, Georgia; T. Richard Cheatham and Marilyn Swinton, Texas; Virginia Katz, Minnesota; Karen L. Monahan, Wisconsin; Alice Ridge, Wisconsin (study number 2); Ron Fetzer, Jerry Feezel, and Robert Vogel, Ohio; Alice Donaldson, Indiana; Marilyn Fuss, Nebraska; William Brooks and Jeanette Winfrey, Oklahoma; Hazel Heiman, North Dakota; Jody L. Nyquist, Washington.

[4]Brooks, op cit, p. 277.

[5]Ibid. p. 278.

[6]The standards are available from the Speech Communication Association, 5101 Backlick Road, Annandale, Virginia 22003.

[7]See Preparation of Elementary and Secondary Teachers in Speech Communication and Theatre. Competency Models and Program Guidelines Recommended by the Speech Communication Association and American Theatre Association, available from SCA.

TABLE 1. DESCRIPTION OF BASIC COURSE

| | Public Speaking | Interpersonal Communication | Activities | Combination |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maryland n= 65 | 5<br>7.7% | 4<br>6.2 | 2<br>3.1 | 54<br>83.1 |
| Massachusetts 114 | 18<br>15.8 | 3<br>2.6 | 3<br>2.6 | 90<br>78.9 |
| Pennsylvania 278 | 76<br>27.3 | 6<br>2.2 | 6<br>2.2 | 190<br>68.3 |
| Georgia 144 | 26<br>18.1 | 1<br>.7 | 12<br>8.3 | 105<br>72.9 |
| Texas 299 | 19<br>6.3 | 2<br>.7 | 19<br>6.3 | 259<br>86.6 |
| Minnesota 260 | 87<br>33.5 | 30<br>11.5 | 26<br>10 | 117<br>45 |
| Wisconsin 142 | 38<br>26.8 | 25<br>17.6 | 14<br>9.9 | 65<br>45.8 |
| Michigan 524 | 100<br>19.1 | 30<br>5.7 | 6<br>1.1 | 388<br>74.0 |
| Indiana 281 | 72<br>25.6 | 5<br>1.8 | 6<br>2.1 | 198<br>70.5 |
| Nebraska 249 | 31<br>12.4 | 10<br>4 | 3<br>1.2 | 205<br>82.3 |
| Oklahoma 50 | 6<br>12 | 0 | 1<br>2 | 43<br>86 |
| North Dakota 137 | 33<br>24.1 | 2<br>1.5 | 4<br>2.9 | 98<br>71.5 |
| Washington 209 | 48<br>22.9 | 5<br>2.4 | 8<br>3.8 | 148<br>70.8 |

TABLE 2: ADVANCED SPEECH COURSES

| | Advanced Speech | Debate | Drama | Oral Interpretation | Radio/TV & Mass Media | Film | Discussion | Interpersonal Communication |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maryland n= 70 | 18<br>25.7% | 8<br>11.4 | 61<br>87.1 | 4<br>57 | 14<br>20 | 2<br>2.9 | 2<br>2.9 | 2<br>2.9 |
| Massachusetts 116 | 17<br>14.7 | 32<br>27.6 | 88<br>75.9 | 15<br>12.9 | 41<br>35.3 | 35<br>30.2 | 14<br>12.1 | 11<br>9.5 |
| Pennsylvania 300 | 59<br>19.7 | 52<br>17.3 | 148<br>49.3 | 39<br>13 | 60<br>20 | 45<br>15 | 25<br>8.3 | 19<br>6.3 |
| Georgia 274 | 19<br>7 | 63<br>23 | 124<br>45.3 | 35<br>12.8 | 53<br>19.3 | 10<br>3.6 | 15<br>5.5 | 8<br>2.9 |
| Texas 321 | 142<br>44.2 | 96<br>29.9 | 197<br>61.4 | 60<br>8.7 | 30<br>9.3 | 17<br>5.3 | 16<br>5 | 28<br>8.7 |
| Minnesota 225 | 63<br>28 | 40<br>18 | 129<br>57 | 50<br>22 | 50<br>22 | 31<br>14 | 25<br>11 | 24<br>11 |
| Wisconsin 117 | 44<br>37 | 27<br>23 | 78<br>66 | 10<br>8.5 | 35<br>30 | 31<br>26 | 8<br>7 | 10<br>8.5 |
| Michigan 549 | 198<br>36.1 | 244<br>45.2 | 367<br>68 | 125<br>23.1 | 121<br>22.4 | 82<br>15.2 | 67<br>12.4 | 57<br>10.6 |
| Ohio 339 | 112<br>33 | 83<br>24.5 | 204<br>60.2 | | 69<br>20.4 | | | |
| Indiana 281 | 119<br>42.3 | 50<br>17.8 | 183<br>65.1 | 33<br>11.7 | 58<br>20.6 | 22<br>7.8 | 15<br>5.3 | 15<br>5.3 |
| Nebraska 253 | 96<br>37.9 | 30<br>11.9 | 100<br>39.5 | 23<br>9.1 | 21<br>8.3 | 11<br>4.3 | 8<br>3.2 | 7<br>2.8 |
| Oklahoma 50 | 20<br>40 | 25<br>50 | 37<br>74 | 4<br>8 | 7<br>14 | 2<br>4 | 6<br>12 | 1<br>2 |
| North Dakota 137 | 23<br>16.8 | 15<br>10.9 | 49<br>35.8 | 0<br>6.6 | 7<br>5.1 | 5<br>3.7 | 3<br>2.2 | 4<br>2.9 |
| Washington 200 | 55<br>25 | 96<br>43.6 | 170<br>77.3 | 27<br>12.3 | 34<br>15.5 | 34<br>15.5 | 11<br>5 | 18<br>8.2 |
| TOTAL = 3252 | | | | | | | | |
| RANK | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| $\bar{X}$ | 30.3 | 26.5 | 59.5 | 14.9* | 18.5 | 11.2* | 7.6* | 7.0* |

*Averages weighted without Ohio

TABLE 3. EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

| | Forensics | Debate | Disoussion/ Student Congress | Theatre |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maryland n= 70 | 30<br>42.9% | 23<br>32.9 | 15<br>21.4 | 63<br>90 |
| Massachusetts 116 | 19<br>16.4 | 44<br>37.9 | 25<br>21.6 | 101<br>87.1 |
| Pennsylvania 300 | 80<br>26.7 | 83<br>27.7 | 70<br>23.3 | 224<br>74.7 |
| Georgia 274 | 76<br>27.8 | 152<br>55.5 | 35<br>12.8 | 183<br>66.8 |
| Texas 321 | 191<br>59.5 | 243<br>75.7 | 69<br>21.5 | 224<br>69.8 |
| Minnesota 225 | 193<br>85.8 | 50<br>22.2 | 37<br>16.4 | 199<br>88:4 |
| Wisconsin 117 | 113<br>96.6 | 40<br>34.2 | 13<br>11.1 | 108<br>92.3 |
| Michigan 549 | 301<br>55.7 | 247<br>45.7 | 103<br>19.1 | 420<br>77.8 |
| Indiana 281 | 115<br>39.4 | 69<br>23.6 | 52<br>17.8 | 236<br>80.8 |
| Nebraska 253 | 200<br>79.1 | 46<br>18.2 | 20<br>7.9 | 218<br>86.2 |
| Oklahoma 50 | 36<br>72 | 21<br>62 | 11<br>22 | 44<br>88 |
| North Dakota 131 | 101<br>72.4 | 19<br>13.8 | 20<br>15.2 | 104<br>74.5 |
| Washington 220 | 104<br>48.6 | 107<br>50.2 | | 154<br>72 |
| TOTAL =2913 | | | | |
| $\bar{X}$ | 53.5% | 39.6 | 17.5* | 78.2 |

*Average weighted without Washington.